

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

---

Archbishop Kingpimp  
Shortymackknifisent, Professah,

Case No. 24-CV-1283 (JMB/DLM)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER**

The State of Minnesota for the Actions  
David S. Doty, William Bolin, and Keith  
Ellison,

Defendants.

---

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Archbishop Kingpimp Shortymackknifisent's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"). (Doc. No. 2.) For the reasons noted below, the Court denies the IFP application and dismisses Shortymackknifisent's Complaint (Doc. No. 1) without prejudice.

Courts must deny an IFP application and dismiss the underlying legal action if a complaint is frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A case is frivolous when "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)); *see also, e.g., Jones v. Norris*, 310 F.3d 610, 612 (8th Cir. 2002) (citing *Neitzke*). This District's courts routinely find that when a complaint has no factual allegations about a given defendant, it is factually frivolous as to that defendant. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Sullivan*, No. 23-CV-2249 (KMM/LIB), 2023 WL 9507608, at \*2 (D. Minn. Nov. 29, 2023) (citing cases), *R&R adopted*, 2024 WL 406587 (D. Minn. Feb. 2, 2024); *Nelson v.*

*Ellison*, No. 23-CV-2122 (JRT/LIB), 2023 WL 7741273, at \*3 (D. Minn. Oct. 27, 2023) (same), *R&R adopted*, 2023 WL 7697051 (D. Minn. Nov. 15, 2023).

The Complaint is a one-page document that appears to name three defendants: (1) the State of Minnesota, which Shortymackknifisent apparently wants held responsible for unspecified actions of U.S. District Judge David S. Doty; (2) William Bolin, the warden of Minnesota Correctional Facility–Stillwater, where Shortymackknifisent was recently confined; and (3) Minnesota Attorney General Keith Ellison. (Doc. No. 1 at 1.) The text of the Complaint appears to be written using highly stylized and illegible script. (*See* Doc. 1.) As best the Court can tell, the Complaint does not set forth under what law or legal theory Shortymackknifisent brings this lawsuit, and it does not explain what Shortymackknifisent believes each defendant did to violate the law. As a result, the Court dismisses this action as frivolous and denies the IFP application.

### ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and all the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. This action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. Plaintiff Archbishop Kingpimp Shortymackknifisent’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 2) is **DENIED**.

**LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.**

Dated: April 26, 2024

/s/ Jeffrey M. Bryan  
Judge Jeffrey M. Bryan  
United States District Court